



MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTES

MAY 11, 2004

4:00 P.M.

ROOM 113

Task Force Members Present	Kit Boesch, Nye Bond, Susan Dunn, Duane Eitel, Margaret Hall, Elaine Hammer, Rick Krueger, Bill McCoy, Tad McDowell, Oscar Pohirieth, Patte Newman, Gordon Scholz, Terry Werner. (Greg MacLean, Eric Miller, Marian Malone absent)
Resource Panel Members Present	Mike Brienzo, Terry Genrich, Randy Hoskins, Jerry Wray
Others Present	Alvin Lugn, Brian Praeuner, Alan Wickman, Kent Morgan, David Cary, Michele Abendroth

Agenda Topics

1. Call Meeting to Order

Mr. Morgan called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and welcomed those present.

2. Public Comment Period (10 min. maximum)

Alan Wickman recommended that the specific suggestions of bike lane locations be removed from the final report. He also noted that he feels his description of the duties of the Pedestrian/Bicycle Coordinator is very good, but is weak when extending it to the multi-modal aspect.

3. UNL Parking Plans - Tad McDowell

Mr. McDowell began his PowerPoint presentation by noting that parking at the University is a “puzzle”. It takes many different aspects to make the system work, including StarTran, University buses, parking, and biking/walking. Planning is an integral part of UNL’s infrastructure. There are two campuses, City Campus and East Campus; his presentation will focus on the City Campus. Although there are many benefits to the Antelope Valley project, it displaces a lot of parking. They estimate they will lose about 4,000 parking stalls due to numerous projects.

He noted 3 strategies to deal with the loss of parking stalls, as follows : restrict parking, find parking off campus and bus students, or build parking garages.

The University feels that restricting parking would have many detrimental affects. Actual parking demand is not reduced. Forty percent of the available parking stalls on City Campus would be permanently lost. Freshman and sophomore parking would be eliminated. Residence hall students would park greater distances from their destinations, and parking on City streets would increase. There would also be a small permit fee increase due to reduced revenue. In addition, enrollment may also be adversely affected.

The University feels that satellite parking would have many negative affects as well. The level of service would be reduced. Forty percent of the available parking stalls would still be lost. Commuting times would increase, and security and extensive transit services would need to be increased. This would not serve campus visitors. Permit fees would also be increased.

The third strategy of building parking garages is the strategy that was chosen by the University. It centralizes parking for all users. It increases safety for residence hall students, and it better serves commuter students arriving to campus. Parking availability for visitors would increase. Pedestrian/vehicle conflicts and disruption during construction periods would be minimized. It also provides a tangible response to permit fee increases.

Once Antelope Valley and the garages are in place, they will be able to reduce the number of buses and increase the functionality of the service.

4. Formulating Final Task Force Recommendations

Mr. Morgan began his PowerPoint presentation by noting that the goal today is to decide what the Task Force wants in the final report. He continued by stating that the recommendations contained in the report must be consistent with the Task Force Charge and the Comprehensive Plan, must encompass a range of alternatives, provide for a balance of activities, reflect the research and community input, include near-mid, and long term activities, and incorporate Task force priorities. The strategic design must have a long term perspective, must be incremental, priority-driven, and sustainable.

Mr. Cary continued the presentation by stating that staff has identified four major recommendation categories, including public transit, pedestrian/bicycle, land use and development, and administration/management. Each category will encompass several activity study areas. Each of these 23 study areas will be addressed in the final report.

Under the first category, **public transit**, the *fixed-route evaluation study* will look at the current function and efficiencies of the StarTran system. *Special transportation coordination* will include monitoring and evaluating the current program and expanding the program as appropriate. The *transit authority* study will look at the desirability of creating a local transit authority for StarTran. *User enhancements* will look at things such as automatic vehicle locators, fare payment approaches, and traveler information systems to make our system more user-friendly. *Marketing* will look at programs that we have today and what we want to do in the future for our marketing program. *Operational enhancements* will identify some of the more physical possibilities, such as bus lanes/HOV lanes, signal pre-emption, circulators, commuter services, and bus turnouts. *Rural transit services* will involve tracking the state's planning study, reviewing the transit authority's role in this area, and monitoring the current services.

The second category, ***pedestrian and bicycle***, will include completing a *bike lane* study, refining and adopting bike lane standards, identifying potential bike lane routes, and seeking program implementation. *Pedestrian standards* will be developed and will be based on concepts contained in the adopted Comprehensive Plan. A “*MMT subarea plan*” will be prepared for residential neighborhoods and commercial districts. *Pedestrian/bike user enhancements* include amenities such as bike racks, bike lockers, drinking fountains, racks on buses, changing areas, and restrooms. The *trails system* will look at many things including maintenance, expansion, grade separations, design characteristics, and signage, and will identify costs for these things. *Pedestrian/bike safety* will look at street crossing design, crash monitoring, and the safe routes to school program.

Land Use and Development, the third category, includes coordination with the fixed route evaluation study and the Downtown Master Plan Study to study the feasibility of constructing a *multi-modal center*. *Multi-modal oriented design* gets at the heart of addressing true multi-modal objectives and includes looking at a mix of residential types, street layout, commercial area design, parking layout and user amenities.. The *hubs and corridors* study will explore the creation of multiple transit hubs and corridors and will take a visionary perspective in defining future development. The *Lincoln-Omaha services* study area will build upon emerging long term regional planning efforts and monitor commuting patterns. *Advanced transit technologies* includes bus rapid transit, light rail transit, and personal rapid transit.

The fourth major category is ***administration/management***. A *MMT resource staff position* is a permanent voice for MMT and would reside within city government. *Public information and education* will look at the public relations program, crash review and pedestrian/bicycle/driver education programs. The *UNL relationship* will focus on continuing to work with UNL to resolve common transportation needs and concerns and build upon existing accomplishments. *Transportation demand management* includes guaranteed ride home programs, smart mortgages, carpool/vanpool programs, transit fare incentives, and preferential parking. Transportation committees and boards will work with other organizations to represent bike and pedestrian interests in the City’s planning and implementation programs.

Mr. Morgan continued the presentation with the pathway activities. There are 23 different categories of activities listed. They have identified seven concepts they feel are most important as pathway activities. They include the fixed route transit study, special services coordination program, transit authority study, bike lane program, pedestrian/bicycle standards, multi-modal center study, and the MMT resources position. Mr. Morgan concluded by asking the Task Force for their input on these recommendations.

5. Other Task Force Discussion

Ms. Dunn asked if the proposed pathway activities would be prioritized. Mr. Morgan replied that they certainly could be prioritized, but it is the Task Force’s decision if and how they should be prioritized.

Mr. McCoy asked if the MMT resources position would be a new position or an additional responsibility placed on current staff. Mr. Morgan responded that the decision will be made by the Mayor and City Council, but the Task Force could forward a recommendation to them.

Mr. Pohirieth commented that the report looks good, but he does not feel directly connected to the report. He would like to have each Task Force member identify what they have learned.

Ms. Hammer stated that she is concerned about how this is going to be perceived in that the public will focus on the bike lanes. She feels we have lost what we really want, specifically, a connected system that includes the trails, lanes, and routes. She also expressed a concern with the transit authority as she believes this is not a good system. Ms. Newman suggested that instead of making reference to a transit authority, we could possibly state that there should be a dedicated funding system.

Mr. Krueger stated that he agrees with Ms. Hammer on the transit authority. He also questions the idea of the multi-modal center being downtown. He then questioned if there is any reason to believe that we are going to add density to our urban environment. He has suggested to allow density to happen, but he does not see the dynamics in place for that to happen.

Mr. Bond asked if this is the first committee to look at multi-modalism. Mr. Morgan responded that this is the first time we have looked at the whole concept. Mr. Bond stated that he feels that is important to remember.

Ms. Boesch suggested putting a timetable to the activities that are being recommended. She feels it is the responsibility of this group to tell the public what the time frame is of the various recommendations.

Mr. Werner stated that he agrees with Ms. Boesch. He also agrees with Mr. Bond in that this is a larger, more comprehensive study than what has been done before. There is more political will to do some of these things now, and he believes that will make a difference. He also feels that we need to create a vision, and the staff resource position will play a big part in that.

Ms. Newman stated that she would like to see the downtown bike lanes made a priority.

Mr. Eitel stated that he agrees with the timeline and setting priorities. He also believes that the resource position could possibly be in Public Works because that is where a lot of these things are implemented.

Mr. Werner stated that he is concerned about what Mr. Pohirieth said about not feeling connected to the process, and asked if it would be helpful to have another meeting for discussion only.

Mr. Morgan suggested meeting next Tuesday, May 18 at 4:00. There was general agreement from the Task Force to meet at this time.

6. Adjourn

Mr. Morgan adjourned the meeting at 5:39 p.m.